arXiv:1512.02973v1 [math.CO] 9 Dec 2015

On Uniform f-vectors of Cutsets in the Truncated Boolean Lattice

Béla Bajnok
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, PA 17325 USA

Shahriar Shahriari
Pomona College
Claremont, CA 91711 USA

August 20, 1997

Abstract

Let $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and let $2^{[n]}$ be the collection of all subsets of $[n]$ ordered by inclusion. $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a *cutset* if it meets every maximal chain in $2^{[n]}$, and the *width* of $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is the minimum number of chains in a chain decomposition of $\mathcal{C}$. Fix $0 \leq m \leq l \leq n$. What is the smallest value of k such that there exists a cutset that consists only of subsets of sizes between m and l, and such that it contains exactly k subsets of size i for each $m \leq i \leq l$? The answer, which we denote by $g_n(m, l)$, gives a lower estimate for the width of a cutset between levels m and l in $2^{[n]}$. After using the Kruskal-Katona Theorem to give a general characterization of cutsets in terms of the number and sizes of their elements, we find lower and upper bounds (as well as some exact values) for $g_n(m, l)$.

1 Introduction

Let $2^{[n]}$ be the *Boolean lattice* of order n, that is the lattice of all subsets (often called *nodes*) of $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ ordered by inclusion. For $0 \leq m \leq n$ we define the m-th *level set* $\binom{[n]}{m}$ of $2^{[n]}$ as the set of all subsets of size m. The *f-vector* (or *profile*) $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ of a collection of subsets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is defined by $f_m = |\mathcal{A}_m|$ where $\mathcal{A}_m = \mathcal{A} \cap \binom{[n]}{m}$ and $0 \leq m \leq n$.

A collection of $l+1$ subsets $A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \cdots \subset A_l$ in $2^{[n]}$ is called a *chain* of length l. A *maximal chain* in $2^{[n]}$ is one that has length n. A collection of w nodes with the property that none of them contains another is called an *antichain* of size w. The *length* and the *width* of a collection of subsets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ are defined as the length of the longest chain and the size of the largest antichain in $\mathcal{A}$, respectively.

A *cutset* in $2^{[n]}$ is defined as a collection of subsets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ which intersects all maximal chains. Trivially, every collection $\mathcal{C}$ which contains $\emptyset$ or $[n]$ is a cutset. In [3] we proved that for $n \geq 2$, the width of a cutset in the Boolean lattice of order n which does not contain $\emptyset$ or $[n]$ is greater than or equal to $n-1$, and that for $n \geq 3$ there exist cutsets of width $n-1$ in $2^{[n]}$. Thus, it is possible to construct a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ with f-vector $(0, \underbrace{n-1, n-1, \ldots, n-1}_{n-1}, 0)$. We then may ask for the smallest value of k for which there is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ with f-vector $(0, \underbrace{k, k, \ldots, k}_{n-1}, 0)$. The original goal of our work was to show that this value is $n-2$ (see Corollary 3 below).

More generally, for $0 \leq m \leq l \leq n$ we define $g_n(m,l)$ to be the smallest value of k for which the $n+1$-tuple $(f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, defined by $f_i = k$ if $m \leq i \leq l$ and 0 otherwise, can be the f-vector of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$. Thus our goal above is then to find $g_n(1, n-1)$. Note that by symmetry we have $g_n(m,l) = g_n(n-l, n-m)$, so we may assume without loss of generality that $m \leq l \leq n-m$.

Before studying $g_n(m,l)$, we give a general characterization of f-vectors of cutsets in $2^{[n]}$. For a given profile $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ and integer m_0 with $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$, we construct a *canonical* collection of subsets $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$, with the property that there is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ with profile $\mathbf{f}$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset for some (or every) $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$. We then translate this qualitative criterion to a quantitative one: For a given $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ and $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$, we describe an easily computable value $q(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$, so that $\mathbf{f}$ will be the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ exactly when $f_{m_0} \geq q(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ for some (or every) $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$. These characterizations, which we present in Section 2, are essentially due to Daykin [7] (for a correction see [5] and then [4]), though we follow a treatment which is more suitable for our purposes.

We can then determine the values of $g_n(m,l)$ for $l \leq m+2$. Namely, we prove the following.

Theorem 1 *Let n be a positive integer.*

1. $g_n(m,m) = \binom{n}{m}$ *for every integer* $0 \leq m \leq n$.
2. $g_n(m,m+1) = \binom{n-1}{m}$ *for every integer* $0 \leq m \leq n-1$.
3. $g_n(m,m+2) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j}$ *for every integer* $0 \leq m \leq n/2 - 1$.

Next, viewing m as fixed and $n >> m$ (i.e., for all $n > n_0 = n_0(m)$), we develop upper and lower bounds for $g_n(m,l)$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that m and n are non-negative integers and $n >> m$. Then*

1. $\binom{n-2}{m} < g_n(m,l) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j}$ *for every integer* $m+2 \leq l \leq n-m-1$, *and*
2. $\binom{n-3}{m} < g_n(m,n-m) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m} \binom{n-2j-3}{m-j}$.

For $m = 1$ we then get the following results.

Corollary 3 *Suppose that $n > 4$ and $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ are integers. Then*

$$g_n(1,l) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } l = 1 \\ n-1 & \text{if } 2 \leq l \leq n-2 \\ n-2 & \text{if } l = n-1 \end{cases}$$

For $2 \leq m << n$, Theorems 1 and 2 give the "numerator" of the leading term of the m-binomial representation (see section 2) of $g_n(m,l)$. Namely, this value is equal to n if $l = m$, $n-1$ if $l = m+1$, $n-2$ if $m+2 \leq l \leq n-m-1$, and $n-3$ if $l = n-m$. It is striking that for a rather large range of values of l, $g_n(m,l)$ stays essentially unchanged.

We note that in Theorem 2, the ratio of the upper bound to the lower bound is approximately $1 + \frac{m}{n}$, and thus the bounds are rather accurate as $n >> m$.

Extremal problems regarding cutsets in the Boolean lattice have been the object of much study. For example see [8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18].

2 f-vectors of cutsets

Given a collection $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{m}$, the *shadow* and the *shade* of $\mathcal{B}$ will be denoted by $\triangle\mathcal{B}$ and $\triangledown\mathcal{B}$, respectively [1, Chapter 2], and are as usual defined by

$$\triangle\mathcal{B} = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{m-1} \mid A \subseteq B \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

$$\triangledown\mathcal{B} = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{m+1} \mid B \subseteq A \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

We order the elements of $\binom{[n]}{m}$ by the *squashed order* (also called the *colex* order) [1, Chapter 7], that is for $A, B \in \binom{[n]}{m}$, we say $A <_S B$ if the largest element of the symmetric difference of A and B is in B. For $1 \leq K \leq \binom{n}{m}$, we define the *initial collection* $\mathcal{F}_m(K)$ and the *last collection* $\mathcal{L}_m(K)$ at level m as the first and last K elements in the squashed order at level m, respectively. In addition, if $K \leq 0$, then $\mathcal{F}_m(K) = \mathcal{L}_m(K) = \emptyset$. The squashed order has the property that the shadow of an initial collection at level m is an initial collection at level $m-1$, and the shade of a last collection at level m is a last collection at level $m+1$. The Kruskal-Katona Theorem ([14, 16] or [1, Chapter 7]) states that the size of the shadow of K nodes at level m is greater than or equal to the size of the shadow of $\mathcal{F}_m(K)$ and, equivalently, the size of their shade is greater than or equal to the size of the shade of $\mathcal{L}_m(K)$.

Let Ω_n denote the set of $n+1$-tuples of integers $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ such that $0 \leq a_m \leq \binom{n}{m}$ for all $0 \leq m \leq n$. To see whether a given $\mathbf{f} \in \Omega_n$ is the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$, we construct a collection of subsets $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$, called the *canonical* collection of subsets for profile $\mathbf{f}$ and for level m_0 ($0 \leq m_0 \leq n$). As we show below, there is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ with profile $\mathbf{f}$ if and only if this canonical collection is a cutset for some (or every) m_0.

Our construction is as follows. First we let $\mathcal{E}_0^{\uparrow} = \{\emptyset\}$, $\mathcal{C}_0^{\uparrow} = \mathcal{F}_0(f_0)$, and for $1 \leq m \leq n$ we recursively define $\mathcal{E}_m^{\uparrow} = \triangledown(\mathcal{E}_{m-1}^{\uparrow} - \mathcal{C}_{m-1}^{\uparrow})$ and $\mathcal{C}_m^{\uparrow} = \mathcal{L}_m(|\mathcal{E}_m^{\uparrow}|) - \mathcal{L}_m(|\mathcal{E}_m^{\uparrow}| - f_m)$. Then $\mathcal{E}_m^{\uparrow}$ is a last collection at level m, and it is precisely the set of nodes from which there is a chain of length m to $\emptyset$ which is disjoint from $\mathcal{C}_i^{\uparrow}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m-1$. Analogously, we let $\mathcal{E}_n^{\downarrow} = \{[n]\}$, $\mathcal{C}_n^{\downarrow} = \mathcal{L}_n(f_n)$, and for $0 \leq m \leq n-1$ we recursively define $\mathcal{E}_m^{\downarrow} = \triangle(\mathcal{E}_{m+1}^{\downarrow} - \mathcal{C}_{m+1}^{\downarrow})$ and $\mathcal{C}_m^{\downarrow} = \mathcal{F}_m(|\mathcal{E}_m^{\downarrow}|) - \mathcal{F}_m(|\mathcal{E}_m^{\downarrow}| - f_m)$. This time $\mathcal{E}_m^{\downarrow}$ is an initial collection at level m, and it is the set of nodes from which there is a chain of length $n-m$ to $[n]$ which is disjoint from $\mathcal{C}_i^{\uparrow}$ for all $m+1 \leq i \leq n$. Finally, we define $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0) = (\cup_{i=0}^{m_0} \mathcal{C}_i^{\uparrow}) \cup (\cup_{i=m_0+1}^{n} \mathcal{C}_i^{\downarrow})$.

We can easily see that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset if and only if $\mathcal{E}_{m_0}^{\uparrow} \cap \mathcal{E}_{m_0}^{\downarrow} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{m_0}$. Furthermore, the profile $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ of $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies $c_m \leq f_m$ for every m, and if $\mathcal{C}$ is not a cutset, then its profile is exactly $\mathbf{f}$.

For example, let $n = 5$. If $\mathbf{f} = (0, 2, 5, 6, 0, 0)$ then, for all $0 \leq m_0 \leq 5$, $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ becomes

$$\{\{1\},\{2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\},\{1,4\},\{2,4\},\{3,4\},\{1,2,5\},\{1,3,5\},\{2,3,5\},\{1,4,5\},\{2,4,5\},\{3,4,5\}\}.$$

On the other, hand if $\mathbf{g} = (0, 2, 6, 5, 0, 0)$, then for $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{g}, 5)$ we get

$$\{\{1\},\{2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\},\{1,4\},\{2,4\},\{3,4\},\{1,5\},\{1,2,5\},\{1,3,5\},\{2,3,5\},\{1,4,5\},\{2,4,5\}\}.$$

It is easily seen that the first is a cutset, while the second one is a collection with profile $\mathbf{g}$ and not a cutset.

The next two propositions give us useful ways of determining whether a given vector $\mathbf{f} \in \Omega_n$ can be the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$.

Proposition 4 *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \Omega_n$ and $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$. The canonical collection $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ defined above is a cutset if and only if $|\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| \leq \binom{n}{m_0} + f_{m_0}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a cutset, then the assertion follows as $|\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| = |\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cap \mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cup \mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{m_0}| + \binom{n}{m_0} \leq f_{m_0} + \binom{n}{m_0}$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{C}$ is not a cutset, then its profile must be exactly $\mathbf{f}$. Furthermore, as $\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}$ is an initial segment and $\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}$ is a last segment at level m_0, their intersection has size greater than f_{m_0} and their union is all of $\binom{[n]}{m_0}$. Therefore, in this case we have $|\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| = |\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cap \mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cup \mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| > f_{m_0} + \binom{n}{m_0}$. □

The next proposition shows the importance of the canonical collection. It further shows that the choice of m_0 is immaterial.

Proposition 5 *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \Omega_n$. The following are equivalent.*

1. *$\mathbf{f}$ is the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$.*
2. *$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset for some $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$.*
3. *$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset for every $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$.*

Proof. Clearly, if $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset for some $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$, then there is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ with profile $\mathbf{f}$. Therefore, it is enough to prove that if there is an $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ which is a cutset with profile $\mathbf{f}$, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0)$ is a cutset for every $0 \leq m_0 \leq n$.

For $m = 0, \ldots n$, let $\mathcal{A}_m = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid |A| = m\}$. We define $\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_m$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_m$ recursively by $\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_0 = \{\emptyset\}, \mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_m = \bigtriangledown(\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m-1} - \mathcal{A}_{m-1})$ for $m = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and $\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_n = \{[n]\}, \mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_m = \bigtriangleup(\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{A}_{m+1})$ for $m = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a cutset, we must have $\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_m \cap \mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_m \subseteq \mathcal{A}_m$ for every $0 \leq m \leq n$.

Keeping the notations established prior to Proposition 4, we now use downward induction on m to prove that $|\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_m| \geq |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_m|$ and $|\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_m| \geq |\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_m|$ for every $0 \leq m \leq n$. Clearly $|\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_n| \geq |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_n|$. Using, in order, the definition of $\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_m$, the Kruskal-Katona theorem, the triangle inequality, the inductive

hypothesis, the fact that $\mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}$, that $\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}$ is an initial segment at level $m+1$, and the definition of $\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m}| &= |\triangle(\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{A}_{m+1})| \\
&\geq |\triangle \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(|\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{A}_{m+1}|)| \\
&\geq |\triangle \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(|\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}| - |\mathcal{A}_{m+1}|)| \\
&\geq |\triangle \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(|\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}| - |\mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}|)| \\
&= |\triangle \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(|\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}_{m+1}|)| \\
&= |\triangle(\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m+1} - \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}_{m+1})| \\
&= |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m}|,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. The assertion for $|\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m}|$ can be proved similarly.

Our assertion now follows from Proposition 4, as

$$|\mathcal{E}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{E}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| \leq |\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| = |\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cap \mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| \leq |\mathcal{A}_{m_0}| + |\mathcal{B}^{\uparrow}_{m_0} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\downarrow}_{m_0}| \leq f_{m_0} + \tbinom{n}{m_0}.$$

□

A quantitative version of Proposition 5 can be formulated as follows.

Given positive integers K and m, there exist unique integers $a_m > a_{m-1} > \cdots > a_t \geq t \geq 1$ such that

$$K = \binom{a_m}{m} + \binom{a_{m-1}}{m-1} + \cdots + \binom{a_t}{t}.$$

This is called the *m-binomial representation* of K [1, Theorem 7.2.1]. Using the m-binomial representation of K it is easy to describe the set numbered K in the squashed order on the m-th level of the Boolean lattice [1, page 117].

For each positive integer m we define a (boundary) operator ∂_m [11] ([6] and [9] have other notations) on the integers as follows: If K is a positive integer with an m-binomial representation as above then

$$\partial_m(K) = \binom{a_m}{m-1} + \binom{a_{m-1}}{m-2} + \cdots + \binom{a_t}{t-1},$$

and for non-positive K set $\partial_m(K) = 0$. Note that ∂_m is weakly increasing.

With this operator we can write $\triangle\mathcal{F}_m(K) = \mathcal{F}_{m-1}(\partial_m(K))$, and $\bigtriangledown\mathcal{L}_m(K) = \mathcal{L}_{m+1}(\partial_{n-m}(K))$, and the Kruskal-Katona theorem becomes $|\triangle\mathcal{B}| \geq \partial_m(|\mathcal{B}|)$ and $|\bigtriangledown\mathcal{B}| \geq \partial_{n-m}(|\mathcal{B}|)$ where B is a collection of subsets of $[n]$ at level m.

Theorem 6 *For a given $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n) \in \Omega_n$, define $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{f}) = (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ and $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{f}) = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ by:*

$$u_0 = 1 \text{ and } u_{m+1} = \partial_{n-m}(u_m - f_m) \text{ for } m = 0, \ldots, n-1,$$

$$v_n = 1 \text{ and } v_{m-1} = \partial_m(v_m - f_m) \text{ for } m = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Then the following are equivalent.

1. $\mathbf{f}$ *is the profile of a cutset in* $2^{[n]}$.
2. $u_m + v_m - f_m \leq \binom{n}{m}$ *for some* $0 \leq m \leq n$.
3. $u_m + v_m - f_m \leq \binom{n}{m}$ *for every* $0 \leq m \leq n$.

Proof. $(u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ and $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ were chosen so that $|\mathcal{E}_m^{\uparrow}| = u_m$ and $|\mathcal{E}_m^{\downarrow}| = v_m$, so the statements follow from Propositions 4 and 5. □

Note that, as a special case when $f_0 = f_n = 0$, $\mathbf{f}$ is the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$ if and only if $v_0 = 0$ (or if and only if $u_n = 0$).

Remark. We can give a quantitative description of the canonical collection $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, m_0) = (\cup_{i=0}^{m_0} \mathcal{C}_i^{\uparrow}) \cup (\cup_{i=m_0+1}^{n} \mathcal{C}_i^{\downarrow})$ as follows. If levels of $2^{[n]}$ are in the squashed order, then $\mathcal{C}_i^{\uparrow}$ is the segment at level i starting with node numbered $\binom{n}{i} - u_i + 1$ and ending with $\min\{\binom{n}{i} - u_i + f_i, \binom{n}{i}\}$; $\mathcal{C}_i^{\downarrow}$ is the segment at level i starting with node numbered $\max\{1, v_i - f_i + 1\}$ and ending with v_i.

3 Exact values: Proof of Theorem 1

We will use Theorem 6 to determine the values of $g_n(m, l)$ for $l = m$, $m + 1$, and $m + 2$.

The case $l = m$ is obvious. For $l = m + 1$, we can easily see that the canonical collection with profile $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, \binom{n-1}{m}, \binom{n-1}{m}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ (where the nonzero components occur at levels m and $m + 1$) consists of subsets of size m that do not contain n, together with subsets of size $m + 1$ that contain n. This collection is a cutset. On the other hand, the canonical collection with profile $\mathbf{f}' = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, \binom{n-1}{m}, \binom{n-1}{m} - 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is not a cutset as there exists a maximal chain through the node $\{n - m, n - m + 1, \ldots, n\}$ which does not intersect the collection.

For the case $l = m+2$, the result is trivial for $m = 0$ and hence assume that $m \geq 1$. Define $f = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j}$, and we need to prove that $g_n(m, l) = f + 1$. We will show that $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, f + 1, f, f, 0, \ldots, 0)$ (where the nonzero components occur at levels m, $m + 1$, and $m + 2$) is the profile of a cutset, but that $\mathbf{f}' = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, f, f, f, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is not the profile of a cutset.

Before starting the proof we need to establish a binomial identity which establishes a relationship between two *vertical* columns in the arithmetic (a.k.a. Pascal's) triangle. Let n be a positive integer, let $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, and let $0 \leq d \leq m-1$. Using downward induction on d (with base case $d = m-1$) it can be easily shown that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-d-1} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{m-d-1} \binom{n-2j-1}{m+2-j} + \binom{n-2m+2d}{d+2} = \binom{n}{m+2}.$$

In our computations below we rely on the case $d = 0$ of this identity, namely:

$$f + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-1}{m+2-j} + \binom{n-2m}{2} = \binom{n}{m+2}.$$

We now use Theorem 6 to show that $\mathbf{f}$ is the profile of a cutset. Computing $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{f})$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_i &= \binom{n}{i} \qquad \text{for } i = n, n-1, \ldots, m+2, \\
v_{m+1} &= \partial_{m+2}[\binom{n}{m+2} - f] \\
&= \partial_{m+2}[\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-1}{m+2-j} + \binom{n-2m}{2}] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-1}{m+1-j} + \binom{n-2m}{1}, \\
v_m &= \partial_{m+1}[\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-1}{m+1-j} + \binom{n-2m}{1} - f] \\
&= \partial_{m+1}[\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-2}{m+1-j} + \binom{n-2m}{1}] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j} + \binom{n-2m}{0} \\
&= f+1, \\
v_{m-1} &= \partial_m[f+1-f-1] \\
&= 0, \qquad \text{and} \\
v_i &= 0 \qquad \text{for } i = m-1, m-2, \ldots, 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

hence $\mathbf{f}$ is the profile of a cutset. As $\mathbf{f}'$ differs from $\mathbf{f}$ only in its m-th coordinate, we still have $v_m = f + 1$. Continuing, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_{m-1} &= \partial_m[f+1-f] \\
&= \partial_m[\binom{m}{m}] \\
&= \binom{m}{m-1}, \text{ and} \\
v_i &= \binom{m}{i} \qquad \text{for } i = m-1, m-2, \ldots, 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular, $v_0 = 1$, so $\mathbf{f}'$ is not the profile of a cutset. $\square$

Remark. We can also construct a (non-canonical) cutset with f-vector $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, f+1, f, f, 0, \ldots, 0)$ where $f = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{n-2j-2}{m-j}$. We define $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \binom{[n-2]}{m}$ and for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ we let

$$
\mathcal{Q}_j = \{A \cup \{n-1, n-3, \ldots, n-2j+1\} | A \in \binom{[n-2j-2]}{m-j}\},
$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_j &= \{Q \cup \{n-2j+2\} | Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{j-1}\}, \text{and} \\ \mathcal{S}_j &= \{R \cup \{n-2j+1\} | R \in \mathcal{R}_{j-1}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then it is rather straight forward to check that $\mathcal{Q} = \bigcup_{j=0}^{m} \mathcal{Q}_j$, $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{R}_j$, and $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{S}_j$ are collections of nodes at levels m, $m+1$, and $m+2$, respectively, $|\mathcal{Q}| = f+1$, $|\mathcal{R}| = f$, and $|\mathcal{S}| = f$, and that $\mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}$ is a cutset, thus providing a cutset with f-vector $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, f+1, f, f, 0, \ldots, 0)$. We omit the details but only briefly sketch the idea behind the construction: Note that $\mathcal{Q}_0$ consists of *all* subsets of size m that do not contain n or $n-1$. Likewise, $\mathcal{R}_1$ consists of all subsets of size $m+1$ that contain n but not $n-1$ and $\mathcal{S}_1$ consists of all subsets of size $m+2$ that contain n and $n-1$. Thus any maximal chain in $2^{[n]}$ that does not intersect $\mathcal{Q}_0 \cup \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ will have subsets of size m, $m+1$ and $m+2$ that contain $n-1$ but not n. Now the poset of subsets of $[n]$ that contain $n-1$ but not n is isomorphic (as a poset) to $2^{[n-2]}$. We now restrict ourself to this poset and continue the construction recursively.

4 Bounds: Proof of Theorem 2

We need the following propositions.

Proposition 7 *For $m \leq l < n/2$ we have $g_n(m, n-m) \leq g_{n-1}(m, l)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n-1]}$ be a cutset with f-vector $(0, \ldots, 0, g, \ldots, g, 0, \ldots, 0)$, where $g = g_{n-1}(m, l)$ and the nonzero entries are at levels $m \leq i \leq l$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{A}} = \{[n] \setminus A | A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Note that by symmetry $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ is a cutset in the poset $\mathcal{Q}$ consisting of all subsets of $[n]$ that contain n. Now define $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cup \overline{\mathcal{A}}$. Note that since $l < n-l$, $\mathcal{B}$ has f-vector $(0, \ldots, 0, g, \ldots, g, 0, \ldots, 0, g, \ldots, g, 0, \ldots, 0)$, where the nonzero entries are at levels $m \leq i \leq l$ and $n-l \leq i \leq n-m$. It now suffices to show that $\mathcal{B}$ is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$.

Let $\mathcal{C} = C_0 \subset C_1 \subset \cdots \subset C_n$ be a maximal chain in $2^{[n]}$ with $|C_i| = i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$, and suppose, indirectly, that $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a cutset in $2^{[n-1]}$ with support between levels m and l, we must have $n \in C_k$ for every $l \leq k \leq n$. Similarly, since $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ is a cutset in $\mathcal{Q}$, we must have $n \notin C_k$ for every $0 \leq k \leq n-l$. This can only happen if $n-l < l$ which is a contradiction. □

Proposition 8 *Suppose that $m+2 \leq l \leq n-m-1$ and $g_{n-1}(m+1, l-1) > \binom{n-2}{m}$. Then $g_n(m, l) > \binom{n-2}{m}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{f} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, \binom{n-2}{m}, \binom{n-2}{m}, \ldots, \binom{n-2}{m}, 0, \ldots, 0)$, where the nonzero entries occur between levels m and l. Suppose, indirectly, that $\mathbf{f}$ is the profile of a cutset in $2^{[n]}$. Then, by Proposition 5, the canonical collection $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, n)$ is such a cutset. If $C_i = \mathcal{C} \cap \binom{[n]}{i}$ are the level sets of the collection, then it is easy to see that $C_m = \binom{[n-2]}{m}$ and $C_{m+1} = \{A \cup \{n-1\} | A \in \binom{[n-2]}{m}\}$. Therefore $\cup_{i=m+2}^{l} C_i$ is a (canonical) cutset in $\{A \cup \{n\} | A \subseteq [n-1]\}$ of profile $(0, 0, \ldots, 0, \binom{n-2}{m}, \binom{n-2}{m}, \ldots, \binom{n-2}{m}, 0, \ldots, 0)$, where the nonzero entries occur between levels $m+2$ and l. But $\{A \cup \{n\} | A \subseteq [n-1]\}$ is isomorphic to $2^{[n-1]}$, so we must have $g_{n-1}(m+1, l-1) \leq \binom{n-2}{m}$, a contradiction. □

Proposition 9 *Define* $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ *as follows. Let* $f_m = f_{m+1} = f_{n-m-1} = f_{n-m} = \binom{n-3}{m}$, $f_i = f_{n-i} = \binom{n+m-i-1}{m+1}$ *for* $i = m+2, m+3, \ldots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, *and* $f_i = 0$ *otherwise. Then* $\mathbf{f}$ *is not the profile of a cutset in* $2^{[n]}$.

Proof. For $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{f})$ we get the following.

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_i &= \binom{n}{i} \qquad \text{for} \quad i = n, n-1, \ldots, n-m, \\
v_{n-m-1} &= \partial_{n-m}[\binom{n}{n-m} - \binom{n-3}{n-m-3}] \\
&= \partial_{n-m}[\binom{n-1}{n-m} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-1} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-2}] \\
&= \binom{n-1}{n-m-1} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-2} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-3}, \\
v_{n-m-2} &= \partial_{n-m-1}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-1} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-2} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-3} - \binom{n-3}{n-m-3}] \\
&= \partial_{n-m-1}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-1} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-2}] \\
&= \binom{n-1}{n-m-2} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-3}, \\
v_{n-m-3} &= \partial_{n-m-2}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-2} + \binom{n-2}{n-m-3} - \binom{n-3}{n-m-4}] \\
&= \partial_{n-m-2}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-2} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-3}] \\
&= \binom{n-1}{n-m-3} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-4}, \\
v_{n-m-4} &= \partial_{n-m-3}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-3} + \binom{n-3}{n-m-4} - \binom{n-4}{n-m-5}] \\
&= \partial_{n-m-3}[\binom{n-1}{n-m-3} + \binom{n-4}{n-m-4}] \\
&= \binom{n-1}{n-m-4} + \binom{n-4}{n-m-5},
\end{aligned}
$$

and continuing as above, we get $v_k = \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{k+m}{k-1}$ for every $k \geq \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$.

Now note that since $\mathbf{f}$ is symmetrical, for $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{f})$ and $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{f})$ we have $v_i = u_{n-i}$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore

$v_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + u_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} = v_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + v_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} = \binom{n-1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + \binom{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + m}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1} + \binom{n-1}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} + \binom{\lceil n/2 \rceil + m}{\lceil n/2 \rceil - 1} = \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + f_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + f_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$, thus $\mathbf{f}$ cannot be the profile of a cutset by Theorem 6. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 3. The upper bound in 1 follows from Theorem 1 part 3 since $g_n(m,l)$ is weakly decreasing with l. The upper bound in 2 is a consequence of Proposition 7 (take $l = m+2$ assuming $n > 2m+4$) and Theorem 1 part 3. Proposition 9 implies that $g_n(m,n-m) > \min\{\binom{n-3}{m}, \binom{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + m - 1}{m+1}\}$. It is an elementary exercise to check that this minimum is $\binom{n-3}{m}$ for $n >> m$ (e.g. if $n \geq 3^{m+1}(m+1)$), establishing the lower bound in 2. Finally, the lower bound in 1 is a consequence of Proposition 8 taking $l = n-m-1$, and noting that $\binom{n-4}{m+1} \geq \binom{n-2}{m}$ for $n >> m$ (e.g. if $n \geq 8(m+1)$) and the lower bound in 2.

The cases of $l = 1, 2$ (and 3) of Corollary 3 follow from Theorem 1. The assertions for $3 \leq l \leq n-1$ follow from Theorem 2 if $n \geq 18$ (see above). The cases $5 \leq n \leq 17$ were checked directly using Theorem 6 (and a simple computer program). □

We close this section by proving a partial complement to Proposition 7.

Proposition 10 *For $n/2 - 1 < l \leq n-m-2$ we have $g_n(m,n-m) \geq g_{n-1}(m,l)$.*

Proof. Consider the canonical collection $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{f}, l)$ where $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ is defined by $f_i = g_n(m,n-m)$ for $m \leq i \leq n-m$ and 0 otherwise. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a cutset in $2^{[n]}$. Write $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{C \in \mathcal{C} || C| \leq l\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{C \in \mathcal{C} || C| \geq l+1\}$.

Suppose, indirectly, that $g_n(m,n-m) < g_{n-1}(m,l)$. Then $\mathcal{D}_1$ is not a cutset in $2^{[n-1]}$, in particular, $\mathcal{D}_1 \subseteq 2^{[n-1]}$. Since $l \geq n-1-l$, by symmetry $\mathcal{D}_2$ is disjoint from $2^{[n-1]}$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{C}$ is not a cutset in $2^{[n]}$, a contradiction. □

5 Examples and conjectures

The following table has the exact values of $g_n(m,l)$ for $n = 100$, $m = 4$ and every $4 \leq l \leq 96$. These were found using Theorem 6. We have also given the 4-binomial representation of $g_n(m,l)$ in the third column.

l	$g_{100}(4,l)$	4-binomial representation of $g_{100}(4,l)$
4	3,921,225	$\binom{100}{4}$
5	3,764,376	$\binom{99}{4}$
6	3,759,624	$\binom{98}{4} + \binom{96}{3} + \binom{94}{2} + \binom{93}{1}$
7	3,759,526	$\binom{98}{4} + \binom{96}{3} + \binom{93}{2} + \binom{88}{1}$
$8 \leq l \leq 95$	3,759,525	$\binom{98}{4} + \binom{96}{3} + \binom{93}{2} + \binom{87}{1} = \binom{100}{4} - \binom{100}{3}$
96	3,607,527	$\binom{97}{4} + \binom{95}{3} + \binom{92}{2} + \binom{86}{1} = \binom{99}{4} - \binom{99}{3}$

Theorem 1 gives the exact value for $4 \leq l \leq 6$. For $6 \leq l \leq 95$, Theorem 2 gives $3,612,280 = \binom{98}{4} < g_{100}(4,l) \leq \binom{98}{4} + \binom{96}{3} + \binom{94}{2} + \binom{92}{1} + \binom{90}{0} = 3,759,624$. Finally, for $l = 96$, Theorem 2 gives $3,464,840 = \binom{97}{4} < g_{100}(4,96) \leq \binom{97}{4} + \binom{95}{3} + \binom{93}{2} + \binom{91}{1} + \binom{89}{0} = 3,607,625$.

From these and other similar tables we see how $g_n(m,l)$ decreases as l increases from m to $n-m$. Namely, we observe that the decrease is largest from level m to level $m+1$ and from level $n-m-1$ to level $n-m$, quite modest between level $m+2$ and level $2m$, and that, rather strikingly, $g_n(m,l)$ is constant between levels $l = 2m$ and $l = n-m-1$. In fact, we have the following conjectures.

Conjecture 11 *For $n >> m$ we have*

1. $g_n(m,l) = \binom{n}{m} - \binom{n}{m-1}$ *for every* $l = 2m, 2m+1, \ldots, n-m-1$, *and*
2. $g_n(m, n-m) = \binom{n-1}{m} - \binom{n-1}{m-1}$.

Note that the m-binomial representation of $\binom{n}{m} - \binom{n}{m-1}$ starts with $\binom{n-2}{m} + \binom{n-4}{m-1}$ (and $\binom{n-1}{m} - \binom{n-1}{m-1}$ starts with $\binom{n-3}{m} + \binom{n-5}{m-1}$) when $n >> m$ (cf. Theorem 2). Corollary 3 proves our conjectures for $m = 1$, and Theorem 2 establishes that Conjecture 11 provides an upper bound for $m = 2$ since $\binom{n}{2} - \binom{n}{1} = \binom{n-2}{2} + \binom{n-3}{1}$ (and $\binom{n-1}{2} - \binom{n-1}{1} = \binom{n-3}{2} + \binom{n-4}{1}$).

According to Conjecture 11, we have $g_n(m, n-m) = g_{n-1}(m, n-m-2) = g_{n-1}(m,l)$ for $n >> m$ and $2m \leq l \leq n-m-2$. Proposition 7 establishes $g_n(m, n-m) \leq g_{n-1}(m,l)$ for $l < n/2$, while Proposition 10 proves the other direction for $n/2 - 1 < l \leq n-m-2$ (yielding equality when $l = (n-1)/2$).

Note: In a subsequent paper [2], the above conjectures have been somewhat refined and related to other conjectures about the width of cutsets in the truncated Boolean lattice.

References

[1] I. Anderson. *Combinatorics of Finite Sets.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989.

[2] B. Bajnok. On the minimum width of a cutset in the truncated Boolean lattice. *Congr. Numer.*, 130:77–81, 1998.

[3] B. Bajnok and S. Shahriari. Long symmetric chains in the Boolean lattice. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, 75:44–54, 1996.

[4] G. F. Clements. Errata to: Antichains in the set of subsets of a multiset, discrete math. 48 (1984) 23-45. unpublished.

[5] G. F. Clements. Antichains in the set of subsets of a multiset. *Discrete Mathematics*, 48:23–45, 1984.

[6] C. J. Colbourn. *The Combinatorics of Network Reliability.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987.

[7] D. E. Daykin. Antichains in the lattice of subsets of a finite set. *Nanta Math*, 8(2):84–94, 1975.

[8] D. Duffus, B. Sands, and P. Winkler. Maximal chains and antichains in the Boolean lattices. *SIAM Journal of Discrete Mathematics*, 3(2):197–205, 1990.

[9] P. Frankl, M. Matsumoto, I. Z. Ruzsa, and N. Tokushige. Minimum shadows in uniform hypergraphs and a generalization of the Takagi function. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, 69:125–148, 1995.

[10] Z. Füredi, J. R. Griggs, and D. J. Kleitman. A minimum cutset of the Boolean lattice with almost all members. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 5:327–332, 1989.

[11] C. Greene and D. J. Kleitman. Proof techniques in the theory of finite sets. In G.-C. Rota, editor, *Studies in Combinatorics*, volume 17 of *MAA studies in Mathematics*, pages 22–79. The Mathematical Association of America, 1978.

[12] J. R. Griggs. Matchings, cutsets, and chain partitions in graded posets. *Discrete Mathematics*, 144:33–46, 1995.

[13] J. R. Griggs and D. J. Kleitman. Minimum cutsets for an element of a Boolean lattice. *Order*, 6:31–37, 1989.

[14] G. O. H. Katona. A theorem on finite sets. In *Theory of Graphs. Proc. Colloq. Tihany*, pages 187–207. Akademiai Kiado. Academic Press, New York, 1966.

[15] D. J. Kleitman. Extremal problems of hypergraphs. In P. Frankl, Z. Füredi, G. Katona, and D. Miklós, editors, *Extremal Problems for Finite Sets*, pages 355–374. János Bolyai Mathematical Society, Budapest, 1994.

[16] J. B. Kruskal. The number of simplices in a complex. In R. Bellman, editor, *Mathematical optimization techniques*, pages 251–78. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1963.

[17] R. Nowakowski. Cutsets of Boolean lattices. *Discrete Mathematics*, 63:231–240, 1987.

[18] F. Shi and W. Li. The density of a maximum minimal cut in the subset lattice of a finite set is almost one. *Discrete Mathematics*, 123:111–115, 1993.